

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 7-13 remain in the application. Claims 7-13 are subject to examination.

Claims 7-12 have been amended.

The translated specification has been amended to correct a translation error. Support for the change can be found by referring to the priority document at page 7, line 7, page 9, line 22, and page 10, line 6. The German word "Abschnürbereich", which appears at each of those locations, was translated as "cut-off", but the accurate translation is "pinch-off". The error has been corrected.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 7-13 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,031,705 to Gscheidle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,172,383 to Williams under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The reference numerals have been removed from all of the claims.

Claim 7 has been amended to better define the invention. Support for the change can be found by referring to the translated specification at page 10, lines 5-20, for example. A more detailed teaching can be found by referring to page 9, line 18 through page 11, line 13.

Claim 7 now specifies that when a short circuit to the high on board electrical system voltage is conducted to said drain, said MOSFET transistor turns on or remains turned on.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings of Gscheidle and Williams, the invention as defined by claim 7 would not have been obtained. Gscheidle teaches a surge detection device 1 that includes a transistor T1, which becomes conductive when a surge appears on at least one of the inputs e1 and e2 (See column 4, lines 7-9). This causes the MOS transistors T2 and T3 to turn off (See column 4, lines 10-13). Thus it is clear that when there is short circuit to the high on board electrical system voltage that is conducted to the drain of MOS transistor T2 and or T3, these MOS transistors T2 and T3 are turned off.

In contrast, claim 7 specifies that the MOSFET transistor is turned on or remains turned on.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 7. Claim 7 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 7.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 7-13 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$130.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Sterner/
Werner H. Sterner
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

November 3, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101